

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA

Henry C. Hayes, III,)	C/A No. 3:11-1807-JFA-KFM
)	
Plaintiff,)	
)	
vs.)	ORDER
)	
The State of South Carolina; Kershaw County;)	
South Carolina Department of Probation, Parole,)	
and Pardon Services; The City of Camden Police)	
Department,)	
)	
Defendants.)	
_____)	

The *pro se* plaintiff, Henry C. Hayes, brings this action pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983.¹

He is a citizen/resident of Westchester County, New York. In his complaint, the plaintiff makes a variety of vague claims involving a lawsuit he previously filed, an incident when he was robbed, and an incident when he was allegedly falsely arrested, among other things.

The Magistrate Judge assigned to this action² has prepared a Report and Recommendation and opines that the complaint should be summarily dismissed for failure to comply with Rule 8(a) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure which directs that pleadings contain short and plain statements of the basis for the court's jurisdiction and for the basis of plaintiff's claims against the defendants. The Magistrate Judge notes that the plaintiff

¹ The plaintiff has filed this action *in forma pauperis* under 28 U.S.C. § 1915.

² The Magistrate Judge's review is made in accordance with 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(B) and Local Civil Rule 73.02. The Magistrate Judge makes only a recommendation to this court. The recommendation has no presumptive weight, and the responsibility to make a final determination remains with the court. *Mathews v. Weber*, 423 U.S. 261 (1976). The court is charged with making a *de novo* determination of those portions of the Report and Recommendation to which specific objection is made, and the court may accept, reject, or modify, in whole or in part, the recommendation of the Magistrate Judge, or recommit the matter to the Magistrate Judge with instructions. *See* 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1).


was advised to keep the court apprised of his current address and that the plaintiff failed to do so when an order of the court mailed to the plaintiff was returned to the Clerk by the U.S. Postmaster.

The plaintiff was also advised of his right to file objections to the Report and Recommendation, which was entered on the docket on August 9, 2011. However, the plaintiff did not file any objections to the Report within the time limits prescribed. In the absence of specific objections to the Report of the Magistrate Judge, this court is not required to give any explanation for adopting the recommendation. *See Camby v. Davis*, 718 F.2d 198, 199 (4th Cir. 1983).

After a careful review of the record, the applicable law, and the Report and Recommendation, the court finds the Magistrate Judge's recommendation proper and incorporated herein by reference. Accordingly, this action is dismissed without prejudice and without issuance and service of process.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

October 5, 2011
Columbia, South Carolina

A handwritten signature in black ink, reading "Joseph F. Anderson, Jr." in a cursive script.

Joseph F. Anderson, Jr.
United States District Judge